DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 372 CS 502 292

AUTHOR Hamnett, Michael P.
TITLE Ethics and Expectations in Cross-Cultural Social Science Research.
PUB DATE Jul 78
NOTE 54p.; Paper presented at the Annual Speech Communication Association Summer Conference on Intercultural Communication (Tampa, Florida, July 17-21, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Anthropology; Codes of Ethics; *Cross Cultural Studies; *Ethics; Ethnology; Intergroup Relations; Psychology; *Social Science Research; *Social Sciences; *Speech Communication; Standards

ABSTRACT

Designed to answer some of the questions concerning the nature of professional ethics in the fields of anthropology, psychology, and sociology, this report outlines the range of ethical concerns of these three disciplines and describes the way in which these concerns have been previously presented. The first of the three sections of the report deals primarily with incidents, such as Project Camelot, which created both public and professional interest in social science ethics. The second section gives special attention to two statements on ethics: one produced by the American Anthropological Association and the other by a group of cross-cultural psychologists. The final section contains an overview of trends in the relationships between social scientists and those with whom they interact. It also provides examples of changes in the expectations institutions and individuals have of social scientists and suggests the need for further study of the social-ethical aspects of the research process. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED162372

ETHICS AND EXPECTATIONS IN CROSS-CULTURAL SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Michael P. Hamnett
Culture Learning Institute
East-West Center

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael P. Hamnett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper To Be Presented to the Second Annual Conference on Intercultural Communication, July 17-21, 1978, Tampa, Florida

CS502292

ETHICS AND EXPECTATIONS IN CROSS-CULTURAL SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Michael P. Hamnett
Culture Learning Institute
East-West Center

Concern with professional ethics in the social sciences has grown markedly since World War II. Prior to the War there were issues (now considered ethical issues) about which social scientists voiced their concern, but little attention was given to research ethics. There were few references to research ethics in the social science literature and the professional organizations espoused no "codes" of ethics for their members. After the War, this situation changed. Professional organizations formed ethics committees and "ethics statements" or "codes of professional ethics" were proposed and in some cases they were adopted. Articles concerned with the rights and obligations of social scientists began to appear in professional journals and books were devoted to the subject.

What are "professional ethics" for social scientists? Why has there been so much attention devoted to ethics in the social sciences since World War II? What questions do those concerned with ethics pose? To whom do social scientists have obligations? What real function do codes of ethics serve? How much of the concern with ethics is directly related to research? What ethical problems, if any, are unique to cross-cultural or cross-national research? How do the obligations defined in statement of research ethics match with the expectations or perceived rights of non-researchers?

This paper attempts to answer some of these questions in the fields of anthropology, psychology and sociology. It outlines the range of ethical concerns of these three disciplines and describes the way in which these concerns have been presented. It also suggests where research might contribute to

a better understanding of the relationships between social scientists and those with whom they interact.

The paper consists of three sections: (1) an historical overview of the concern with professional ethics in the social sciences; (2) an outline of the rights and obligations of social scientists in cross-cultural research as defined by professional organizations and in the ethics literature; and (3) an evaluation of the degree to which present opinions on the rights and responsibilities of social scientists match with changing opinions of non-social scientists. Section one deals primarily with incidents which stirred both public and professional interest in social science ethics. Section two is the longest and deals with most of the issues discussed in the social science ethics literature. Substantial attention is given to two statements on ethics: (a) the American Anthropological Association[1] "Principles of Professional Responsibility" and (b) a set of "Advisory Principles for Ethical Considerations in the Conduct of Cross-Cultural Research" compiled by Tapp, Kelman, Wrightsman, Triandis and Coelho, a group of cross-cultural psychologists.[2] While ethics statements of professional organizations may not be meaningful unless social scientists profess and adhere to them, these two statements represent some degree of consensus because the opinions of a number of social scientists were solicited and incorporated into them. Section three is an overview of the trends in the relationships between social scientists and those with whom they interact. It provides examples of the changes in what institutions and individuals expect of social scientists and suggests the need for further study of social-ethical aspects of the research process itself.

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Ethics are generally defined as principles of conduct governing an in-

dividual or profession. From the point of view of social scientists, professional ethics define what is proper conduct in their professional roles. Professional ethics delimit the rights and obligations of social scientists and their alters in role relationships.

1. An Historical Over-view of the Concern for Professional Ethics

Widespread interest in defining proper conduct for social scientists began in the late 1940s and early 1950s. In December 1948, the American Anthropological Association Council of Fellows passed a resolution on the freedom of publication urging research sponsors to give anthropologists the right to make public all research findings.[3] The American Psychological Association formulated and adopted its first code of ethics in 1953.[4]

Project Camelot, a research project involving U.S. social scientists and sponsored by the Special Operations Research Office of the Army, caused considerable stir in the American social science community.[5] Camelot, was a project of the Defense Department. It was intended to "determine the feasibility of developing a general social system model which would make it possible to predict and influence politically significant aspects of social change in the developing nations of the world..."[6] The project was aborted as a result of adverse reactions from intellectuals and legislators in Chile.

Following the disclosure of Camelot interest in social science professional ethics grew. Debate among sociologists over a draft Code of Ethics for Sociologists (which was composed over a year before the Camelot disclosure) became intense.[7] The American Anthropological Association adopted a "Statement on Problems of Anthropological Research and Ethics" in 1967.[8]

In psychology, drug research at Harvard and a series of studies of compliance contributed to the concern with professional ethics in the discipline.[9] The compliance experiments involved subjects who were required to administer

what they (wrongly) believed to be increasingly more severe electric shocks to "learners" who made errors in a set of learning tasks. The ethical concern focused on experiments were the potential long term psychological effects (e.g. guilt) on the subjects who believed they were causing pain to other individuals. The Harvard drug controversy involved research on the "consciousness expanding" effects of psilocybin in which Harvard students were used as research subjects.[10]

In January 1963, the American Psychological Association published its "Ethical Standards of Psychologists".[11] This was the second of three statements on ethics made by the A.P.A. It was a descriptive statement describing ethical conduct of a psychologist in his/her roles as teacher, therapist and researcher.

Publications dealing with professional ethics in the social sciences were numerous in the late 1960s. Horowitz's (1967) The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot, Beal's (1969) Politics of Social Research, Sjoberg's (1967) Ethics, Politics and Social Research, Hymes's (1969) Reinventing Anthropology and Kelman's (1968) A Time to Speak are notable contributions to the social science ethics literature of this period. In 1968 an entire issue of Current Anthropology was devoted to the rights and obligations of anthropologists in the modern world.[12]

Interest in professional ethics in the social sciences has been maintained into the 1970s. A "Statement on Ethics" was adopted by the American Anthropological Association in 1971. The American Psychological Association adopted their "Ethical Principles" in December 1972. Text books in anthropology,[13] in psychology[14] and in sociology[15] began to include a section or chapter to ethical considerations in their respective disciplines.

The continued interest in ethics has not been maintained in a social and political vacuum. Those who were students in the late 1960s and early 1970s, some of whom became social scientists, questioned many previously accepted ideologies including the value and morality of science itself.[16] Social science has been charged with colonialism and exploitation both ideologically[17] and in terms of what social scientists do.[18] Movements within the social sciences such as the "sociology of sociology,"[19] "critical sociology,"[20] the "post-behaviorist revolution" in political science,[21] "radical anthropology,"[22] "reflexive and critical anthropology"[23] have questioned some of the assumptions about the "objectivity" of social sciences and the responsibilities of social scientists to their own societies and the people they study.

Incidents such as the alleged involvement of social scientists in counter-insurgency research in Thailand have also served to keep social science research ethics in the minds of practitioners.[24] The Thailand incident resulted in heated debate within the American Anthropological Association and a "Statement of the Executive Board of the Association" specifically dealt with the issue.[25]

Project Themis, a federally funded effort "...to upgrade scientific and engineering performances at colleges and universities for the benefit of the Defense Department..." added fuel to the burning ethical fire in sociology.[26]

In psychology a series of issues has kept ethics in the forefront. The genetic-nativist[27] and environmentalist[28] debate over I.Q. and its implications for compensatory education programs resulted in controversy in the academic literature and in the popular press. One issue was the ethics of the psychologists' use of I.Q. tests to make statements about Blacks' (since the tests were developed with white middle-class children) performance

potential in schools. The "mock prison" experiment[29] which was aborted "...because the pathological reactions elicited in subjects chosen precisely for their normality, sanity and emotional stability" was one of a number of studies which sustained a focus on the potential deleterious psychological effects of experimentation.

2. The Lack of Consensus on Ethics in the Social Sciences

There has never been universal agreement within the social science disciplines about what is ethical. Some indication of the lack of consensus on ethical issues is revealed in the reactions of the members of two U.S. social science professional organizations to the adoption of codes of ethics. The memberships of the American Sociological Association (A.S.A.) has been so divided on the issue of whether the Association should have a code of ethics at all that one has never been adopted. Sjoberg[30] reports that the A.S.A. Committee on Ethics observed two rather divergent points of view opposing the adoption of a code for the Association. The first holds that sociologists intervene in any study they make, they view research problems from particular perspectives, their findings inevitably reflect those perspectives and that any code of ethics "...is flying in the face of reality." The other view holds that a code of ethics is unnecessary because sociologists are primarily scientists and that they "...have no ethical problems not shared by all scientists".[31] Becker in one of the two letters opposing the adoption of a code appearing in the American Sociological Review the year the draft code was proposed notes that the code "...is equivocal or unenlighteningly vague in dealing with most problems distinct to social science...It is so because there is no consensus about such problems; many sociologists would disagree with any more forthright statement in either direction."[32]

The American Psychological Association (A.P.A.) Ad hoc Committee on

Ethical Standards in Psychological Research expressed the same sort of division within the ranks of that Association. This occurred after drafting a code,[33] surveying 1,000 A.P.A. members, revising their survey instrument, soliciting research descriptions from 9,000 A.P.A. members, soliciting a second sample of 9,000 and additional descriptions from specialized groups within the A.P.A. membership, redrafting the code, reviewing the code with A.P.A. members and state, city and specialists' associations, requesting opinions from people in other disciplines, preparing a new draft, publishing it,[34] soliciting reactions to the new draft, and making further revisions. When the code was finally adopted by the Council of Representatives of the A.P.A. in December 1972, there was still dissatisfaction. The Ad hoc Committee reports that some members felt the research principles "...failed to prohibit, unqualifiably, research activities they believed to be harmful to research participants...".[35]

Opposition to the adoption of the "Ethical Principles" in the American Psychologist followed some of the same lines as that in sociology. Gergen[36] argued that there is too little known about the effects of research ethics on human subjects and on professional behavior and he advocated the accumulation of more knowledge before a statement is adopted.[37]

Thus far I have treated social scientists as a group and described social science professional associations in terms of their similar response to ethical problems. There have certainly been common concerns among members of each of the disciplines. The interest in professional ethics within psychology, sociology and anthropology began at about the same time and there have been contemporaneous critical incidents which kept professional ethics in the professional journals and popular press. Camelot and the Milgram studies became public in 1964. Book-length treatises on research ethics by

anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists appeared in 1967, 1968 and 1969.[38] The Thailand affair and the debate over intelligence testing were important issues in 1969-1970. The sociological study of [illegible]sociology and like movements in anthropology and political science became popular in the early 1970s.[39]

Two other common characteristics of the concern with professional ethics within anthropology, psychology and sociology (which are addressed in more detail below) should be noted before disciplinary differences are discussed. First, aside from psychotherapy in psychology, research has been the area of professional behavior that has received the most attention. Second, cross-cultural research has been the source of much of the controversy, (especially in anthropology, sociology and political science) and the most fruitful in generating comprehensive statements on professional responsibility.

The differences among the social science disciplines both in the nature of their concern with ethics and in their response to that concern have been reflections of the research orientation of each discipline and the types of research that have brought criticism from outside the profession.

In recent developments of ethical statements psychologists have limited their attention, almost entirely, to the protection of research subjects in experimental situations. The American Psychological Association's ethics statement is entitled "Ethical Principles in the Conduct of Research with Human Participants."[40] The only mention of what the social scientist's relationship should be with actors other than "participants" or "subjects" in the research enterprise is that the investigator bears responsibility for the "...ethical treatment of research participants by collaborators, assistants, students, and employees, all of whom, incur parallel obligations" (principle 2). As already noted, the incidents which have generated much of the public

and professional concern with professional ethics have been potentially "dangerous" experiments.[41]

In an effort independent of the A.P.A., the "Advisory Principles for Ethical Considerations in the Conduct of Cross-Cultural Research: Fall 1973 Revision" were developed by Tapp et al. for cross-cultural psychologists. These "advisory principles" are much broader in scope that the A.P.A. code and, as described in more detail below, they reflect the influence cross-cultural research has had on ethical concerns in general. They also reflect the general view that cross-cultural or cross-national research compounds ethical problems inherent in doing research within one's own society.[43]

In anthropology and sociology, most of the ethical concern has focused on the involvement of members of these disciplines in counter-insurgency research and "spying." Anthropology's association with spying is not a new one. Franz Boas, the "father of American Anthropology" protested the U.S. government's use of anthropology as a cover for spying in 1919.[44] Camelot and the Thailand affair, both of which allegedly involved anthropologists and sociologists have dominated discussions of ethics in both disciplines. Perhaps as a result of the number of parties involved in these critical incidents, the ethics literature in sociology and in anthropology has given more attention to a greater number of role relationships than have the psychologists. The fact that anthropologists and sociologists tend to deal with people in the "real world" rather than in the laboratory is an obvious explanation for the attention given the rights and obligations of social scientists visavis persons (and institutions) other than research participants. The fact that anthropologists tend to deal less with large scale survey research and more with intensive field work with small populations is perhaps

an explanation for what Sjoberg sees as sociology's lack of attention to ethical problems in public discussion.[45]

CROSS-CULTURAL - CROSS-NATIONAL RESEARCH ETHICS

Cross-cultural and cross-national research have generated much of the concern with professional social science ethics as indicated above. Among those who have written on ethics in social science, many agree that ethical problems are more complex in cross-cultural research than in work within one's own culture.[46] This is, as I have indicated, one explanation for the amount of ethics literature dealing with cross-cultural and cross-national research. It is also an explanation for the relative comprehensiveness of the American Anthropological Association's "Principles of Professional Responsibility" and the draft "Advisory Principles" developed by Tapp et al.[47] compared to the A.P.A. code of 1973.

The Tapp et al. "Principles" and the American Anthropological Associations "Statements on Ethics" represent some degree of consensus on the rights and responsibilities of cross-cultural researchers.[48] The A.A.A.'s "Statements" was adopted by the organizations Council in 1971. The Tapp et al. "Advisory Principles" represents the results of over two years of consultation with cross-cultural psychologists from several countries and reactions to presentations at (U.S.) national and international professional meetings. Because the two statements are quite comprehensive and do reflect a greater degree of consensus than works by any single author, they are given more attention in this paper than the ethics literature.

There are differences in the two sets of ethical principles. They are products of two different disciplines with divergent research orientations and histories of ethical concern. The A.A.A. "Statement on Ethics" is "official"

in that it was adopted by the largest anthropology professional association in the world. The Tapp et al. "Advisory Principles" have no official status and have not been formally adopted by any organization. They are, however, a result of more extra-disciplinary and international consultation than the A.A.A. statement. This statement covers areas of professional responsibility other than research. The Tapp et al. principles are concerned only with research ethics. The Tapp et al. statement is considerably more detailed and more than twice the length of the A.A.A. "Statement." Despite these differences and those outlined below, the two statements are very similar in the role relationships with which they deal and the rights and obligations associated with those relationships.

An examination of these two sets of Principles reveals that a total of 7 role relationships are recognized as significant in the cross-cultural researcher's role set (See Table I). The role relationships recognized in these two statements include most of those mentioned in the ethics literature of anthropology, psychology and sociology cited in this paper. All seven are mentioned in Sjoberg's introduction to Ethics, Politics and Social Research as "reference groups" and he adds the international political system to local and own government.[49]

The A.A.A. "Statement", like the American Psychological Association's 1963 "Ethical Standards of Psychologists," includes principles of professional responsibility to students excluded by Tapp et al., who are only concerned with research. This paper will deal only with research ethics and the relationship between a social scientist and his or her students will not be discussed.

The A.A.A. statement fails to mention the responsibility of a foreign researcher to seek local collaboration and does not detail responsibilities

to local collaborators and colleagues. Tapp et al. invest over one third of their document to a discussion of these responsibilities.

The A.A.A. statement makes specific mention of responsibilities of the researcher to "own and host government." Tapp et al. note that research should be cleared with "appropriate authorities in the host community whenever such clearance is necessary to protect the interests and safety of subjects and to maintain access and good will for future researchers." They also advise that researchers should "recognize the boundaries of ...(their) personal competence and the limitations of psychological techniques in dealing with funding agencies and with authorities in the host community."[50]

Aside from these differences, the role relationships recognized by Tapp et al. have equivalents in the Statement on Ethics of the American Anthropological Association and visversa.

A. Obligations to Subjects and Host Communities

Both the A.A.A. "Statement" and Tapp et al.'s "Advisor Principles" devote a large part of their attention to the researcher's obligations to the people studied and their rights vis-a-vis the researcher. As indicated above, this has been a major focus for much of the ethics literature.[51] The rights and obligations described by Tapp et al. and the A.A.A., although geared for cross-cultural research, include the obligations cited in the ethics literature for working within one's own society. These rights and obligations fall into five general categories: (1) ethical evaluation; (2) respect for the subjects' rights; (3) openness in communication; (4) protection of the subjects' welfare and dignity; (5) benefit to the participants; and (6) respect for the host culture.

1. Both statements agree that the primary responsibility for the ethical evaluation of and behavior in a research project lies with the investigator.[52]

TABLE I

Role Relationships In Cross-National Social Science Research

Researchers	AND	Subjects and Host Community
Researchers	AND	Collaborators in the Host Community
Researchers	AND	Members of the Discipline
Researchers	AND	The Public
Researchers	AND	The Sponsor of the Research
Researchers	AND	His/Her Own Government
Researchers	AND	The Host Government

Until recently, no other group of individuals regularly policed the research enterprise to the extent that social scientists did.[53] Indeed scholars have resisted any restrictions on their behavior by non-social scientists.[54] It will be argued below that ethics statements or principles of professional responsibility may be the social scientists' attempt to police their own activity before someone else does it for them.

2. The second general category of responsibilities to the "participants" or "subjects" in the two statements is "respect for subjects' rights." Tapp et al. give more attention to this category than the anthropologists and include the obligation that the agreement between the researcher and the subjects to interact with the research enterprise should be clear and fair within the context of the host culture. This may be axiomatic to the anthropologists or an issue they simply do not want considered because of the complexity of decisions about "fairness" or the restrictions this would place on research. The A.A.A. statement does say that the sensitivities of the subjects must be safeguarded. Tapp et al. also see the cross-cultural researcher as responsible for conducting significant ("not trivial") research because trivial research "...extracts costs without returns in the form of contributions to knowledge and human welfare."[55] This obligation and those described below under "benefit to participants" is one of the most significant issues in the ethics literature.

Both Tapp et al. and the A.A.A. recognize the right of potential subjects to refuse participation. This assumes that the obligation (which both statements address) of "honesty" and "open communication" has been fulfilled (see below).

Some writers have questioned the ability of those usually studied by

social scientists (i.e. minority groups and the colonized) to resist being studied because they do not perceive themselves as having the right to refuse to participate.[56] As indicated below, this perception is changing and many groups are exercising their "right not to be studied."

In an apparent attempt to insure the willingness of people to be studied, professional organizations (and as described below the U.S. government) have turned to the notion of "informed consent." Again, assuming the obligation of "open and honest communication" about the procedures and consequences of the research project has been fulfilled, the researcher is obliged to obtain the consent of subjects before they are studied.[57] This requirement poses problems for experimental psychologists who sometimes employ deception in their research.[58] Experimental evidence indicates that disclosure of the purpose of experiments (in which there is no likelihood of physical or psychological stress) can markedly influence the results.[59] For anthropologists and sociologists the principle of informed consent poses no particular problem aside from that of communicating one's purpose. However, if required by a government or granting organization to obtain (written) proof of informed consent before a project is funded, cross-national research may have to be curtailed because researchers cannot select their subjects until after the project has started.[60]

3. The third obligation of the researcher to his/her potential or actual participants is <u>open communication</u>. Honesty and full disclosure of the purpose, source of financial support, the researcher's qualifications for and potential outcomes of a research project are viewed by Tapp et al. and the A.A.A. as the researchers obligation not only to the "participants" or "subjects" but to all those involved in the research enterprise. The issue of deception in psychological research has already been mentioned. It has, as indicated,

received a great deal of attention. "Deception" in the sociology and anthropology literature has centered on "spying" and counter-insurgency research[61] and with obtrusiveness in participant-observation.[62] Accordingly, the Tapp et al. statement allows for some deception and provides for the option of consultation with members of the host community on the acceptability of deception. The A.A.A. statement is less extensive in its demands for informed consent. Both statements are, however, in agreement on the issue of clandestine social science research which no writers on research ethics defend.[63]

4. The fourth general category of obligations to research subjects in the two statements is "the protection of subjects welfare and dignity." This category includes: obligations to anticipate possible deleterious effects of the research, and misuses of the findings; and to keep confidential data collected and to protect the anonymity of respondents. Tapp et al. reflect their discipline's greater concern for the physical and psychological effects of research which, as noted above, is the focus of the entire set of "Ethical Principles" of the American Psychological Association. The majority of the "protection of welfare and dignity" literature focuses on potential physical and psychological harm resulting from experimental research.[64] Some, however, deals with the possible legal and moral implications of breaches of confidentiality and anonymity.[65] Social scientists appear to feel that if their potential subjects have consented to be studied (with the knowledge of the procedures and consequences of the study) they have to some degree fulfilled their obligation to protect the welfare of their subjects.[66]

5. The fifth category of obligations to subjects included in both statements is "benefit to the participants" or subjects. The A.A.A. statement

simply states that: "There should be no exploitation of individual informants for personal gain. Fair return should be given for all services." Tapp et al. indicate that: "The total research experience should enrich and benefit in some way the individual subjects and the host community." They go on to specify that research priorities should consider local needs, the results should be made available to host communities in "understandable form," and something of lasting value should be contributed.

Discussion over whether host communities must benefit from research done by outsiders has been considerable and this issue is likely to become increasingly more crucial as communities and nations decide whether or not they want to interact with foreign researchers.[67] It touches on the applied vs pure research debate[68] and the belief that applied social science research and the application of research findings entails greater potential ethical liability than pure research.[69] A seemingly antithetical view, which as yet seems a minority position among social scientists, is that it is unethical not to apply research to local, national or human problems.[70] On the other hand, some social scientists see potentially more benefit from "pure" than "applied" research in the long run, but whether "strictly scientific studies" will be tolerated by research subjects or their governments is questionable.[71]

6. The last category of obligations to research subjects is "<u>respect for the host culture</u>." Again Tapp et al. enumerate greater obligations than does the A.A.A. They state that the investigator should respect the cultural integrity of the site, not violate expectations or reveal a culturally biased perspective, become knowledgeable about the culture, avoid over saturation of a particular community and attend to the technical problems of equivalent measurement. The A.A.A.[72] notes that researchers should cooperate with members of the host society in all aspects of a project (as do Tapp et al.)

and recognize the (potential?) cultural pluralism of host societies and the plurality of interests, values and demands. The obligation to respect a host culture may be an assumed obligation of anthropologists.[73]

Cross-cultural psychologists (a minority within the broad discipline of psychology) tend to champion the notion that cultural differences must be carefully examined in psychological research in different societies.[74] This may account for the attention given "respect for host culture" in the Tapp et al. statement.

The greatest attention given to obligations of researchers under this rubric in the social science research ethics literature is probably in the protests against "spying" and counter-insurgency research which has already been discussed at length.

B. Obligations to Collaborators and Colleagues in the Host Community

Tapp et al. give considerable attention to the obligations of cross-cultural researchers to collaborate with social scientists in the host community and define, in detail, the obligations of researchers to those with whom they work. The A.A.A. statement makes no mention of collaboration. Anthropological research has, for the most part, involved a lone researcher working in a single community. Psychologists and sociologists have, I think, done much more team research. This is clear from an examination of the works cited in this paper: those written by anthropologists are almost all single author works; those written by sociologists are more often done by more than one author; and a majority of the psychology literature is collaborative. This may account for the lack of attention given collaboration in the A.A.A. statement.

The collaboration between foreign researchers and social scientists in the "host country" has received considerable attention in the ethics and the cross-

national research literature. It has also become an obligation demanded of foreign researchers by some host-country governments and lobbied for by social scientists in third world countries. The value of collaboration to the research enterprise and the globalization of the social sciences has been noted by many sources.[75] Most of these sources on cross-national collaborative research note that the organization and ethical problems of cross-national collaborative research are numerous. The range of obligations in Tapp et al. covers most of the problem areas discussed in the literature.

The obligation to collaborate with host-society scholars, as Tapp et al. outline, includes (where feasible) equal participation in all phases of research (planning, data collection, data analysis, and publication), and full knowledge of purpose and funding. Researchers should be aware of "...subtle expressions of exploitation..." in the research relationship and establish a clear understanding of the rights and obligations of all those involved in the research with a recognition of cultural differences among the researchers. The research should not jeopardize the career of host country collaborators and be of benefit to them. The researcher has an obligation to continue a reciprocally balanced exchange with the local research community.

While the obligation to collaborate and the obligations of the researcher to his/her collaborators appear extensive, they are probably a reflection of the views of non-American psychologists who were consulted in the writing of the Tapp et al. statement.[76]

C. Responsibilities to the Discipline and the Research Enterprise

Both the Tapp et al. and the A.A.A. statements detail obligations to the discipline(s) and the research enterprise under three general categories: (1) "Competence", (2) "Publication" and (3) "Public and Scientific". Both

agree that social scientists should be honest about their capabilities and limitations because the actions of social scientists reflect on other members of their disciplines and the social scientific community as a whole. One of the complaints about the Camelot affair was that those involved were not experienced senior academics competent to do the things Camelot was allegedly supposed to do.[77] Out of self interest, I think social scientists as a group should make clear not only their personal limitations, but the limitations of social science itself.

The second area of responsibility to the discipline and the research enterprise is publication. Both statements indicate that "free and open publication are a central feature of scientific research and that production of public knowledge legitimizes requests for cooperation and assistance."[78] As noted above, this was the point of the A.A.A. 1948 "Resolution on Freedom of Publication" and it has continued to be a major ethical concern in anthropology and in the other social science disciplines.[79] The concern has largely been focused on restrictions of publications in "contract research" and government grants [80] and on the effects of political pressure on public reporting of research findings.[81] This is one aspect of the notion that science must be free from restrictions and non-scientific influence if it is to be "objective" or at least fulfill its function.[82] This belief has lost favor within the social science community as the possibility of "objectivity" has been questioned and has probably never been widely shared by non-social scientists.[83]

The A.A.A statement explicitly states that the researcher should in no way falsify or color his/her findings. The Tapp et al. statement notes that publication should be "sufficiently detailed and explicit to enable scientific peers to evaluate findings and place them in perspective..." As

already noted, the notion of "objective" social science has been questioned in recent years and thus the issue of "coloring" one's findings may be naive.[84] The psychologists approach of allowing for the evaluation (or replication) of findings may be more realistic but perhaps impractical given the anthropologist's style of research.

The obligation to the disciplines and the public to maintain the freedom of publication does not, according to Tapp et al. and the A.A.A., supercede the obligation to protect subjects from harm through violations of anonymity.[85] The tension between open disclosure of findings and the protection of research subjects has also been noted widely in the ethics literature.[86]

Tapp et al. list an obligation "communicate, where desirable, research findings in media that reach wider audiences..." This is an issue addressed also by the A.A.A. statement but one which is not discussed in the ethics literature. Although not generally mentioned in print, some social scientist disdain the "popularization" of social science and little attention is given to the social scientists obligation to the public.

Both Tapp et al. and the A.A.A. statement are explicit about the researchers' obligation to their discipline and the scientific enterprise not to jeopardize the future of research in the communities in which they study. This may be at the root of the social scientists concern with ethics in research.

It is clear from academia's response to Camelot[87] and other incidents which have brought public or governmental disapproval of the behavior of social scientists that the ethical indignation of the scientific community over the behavior of their colleagues and that the formulation of codes of ethics are at least in part attempts to keep "the world safe for anthropology..."

and the other social science disciplines.[88] Despite the efforts of social scientists to keep their world safe, the number of communities and nations which will permit research to be done is decreasing.[89]

D. Responsibilities to the Public

The A.A.A. statement explicitly states that "the anthropologist is also responsible to the public - all presumed consumers of his professional efforts. To them (s)he owes "a commitment to candor and to truth in the dissemination of his/her research results and in the statement of his opinion as a student of man."[90]

One of the most widely discussed issues in the ethics literature is the question: who is the social scientists' public? Several sources have clearly shown that there is no one public, and that various factions have different interests in the product of research.[91] How much the moral obligation of openness and candor influences the social scientist's decisions about what to study and what to say based on his/her findings in the political and economic real world is an unanswered question. The sources cited above indicate that the moral obligation cannot compete with economic and political pressures.[92] How much the moral obligation will suffer in its conflict with economic necessity in an increasingly tight job market is another question as yet unanswered.

E. Responsibilities to the Sponsor

Both the Tapp et al. and the A.A.A. statement mention responsibilities to the sponsor of research, but the responsibilities or obligations are limited to honesty about one's qualifications, the nature of the research, and the researcher-sponsor relationship. Both documents list limitations of responsibility in terms of the rights of researchers to publish their findings

openly, both of which have been discussed above.

An issue which neither Tapp et al. nor the A.A.A. address which has received considerable attention in the ethics literature is: From whom should the social science researcher accept sponsorship? Some writers question the advisability of government sponsored cross-national research, especially that funded by military and intelligence gathering agencies.[93] Others have noted that sponsors inevitably influence the choice of topic and results produced, and they warn that social science must remain removed from the influence of sponsors if the purpose of science is to be served.[94] Some advocated the foundation of the National Social Science Foundation to insure the independence of social science research.[95] Others advocate provisions for small grants to individual scholars and less to research institutions whose survival is dependent on grants.[96] Again, as the ranks of social scientists grow and the competition for research money increases, it seems likely that the degree of independence of social science researchers will decline.

F. Responsibilities to Own Government

The A.A.A. statement addresses the question of the researchers responsibility to his own government and to the host government. The Tapp et al. statement makes no specific reference to either, but, as indicated above, it does state that research activities should be cleared with authorities in the host community. The A.A.A. statement limits the obligations to own and host government to obligations of honesty and candor.

Much of the ethics literature, as already indicated, deals with the relationship between social science researchers in the U.S. and the federal government. Government sponsorship has already been discussed. Government

control of research aside from that which occurs in government funded research has been limited largely to the "protection of human subjects". The U.S. State Department's attempt to maintain control over foreign area research in the Camelot affair brought reactions from U.S. academics and the U.S. Army.[97]

For social scientists outside the U.S., government control reportedly takes forms other than that exercised in government sponsored research.[98] In some countries, foreign researchers have had greater access to important sources of data than scholars from those countries to whom access is restricted.[99] Such differences in the amount of government control and the relative accessability of data (and funds for research) have created tensions among social scientists from different countries.[100] They have also probably contributed to the development of restrictions on foreign researchers by some governments.

Restrictions of the freedom of (social and natural) scientists to pursue research and speak freely about it have been a concern of U.S. scholars for some time. In 1976, the American Association for the Advancement of Science established a Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility.[101] The Committee deals with restrictions of scientific freedom in the U.S. and abroad through sub-committees concerned with each. They have established a clearinghouse for cases of the persecution of foreign scholars. In 1977, one hundred twenty cases were reported and were under review at the end of that year. The Committee also has appealed to Congress for the removal of visa restrictions on scientists who may have been members of communist or anarchist political organizations.[102]

Agreement on the question of whether scientists from one country should

lobby for the freedom of scientists in another country has not been unanimous. The President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science criticized scientific organizations for coming to the aid of colleagues outside their own country who are suffering from activities unconnected with science.[103]

A development in the relationship between U.S. social scientists and their government is the development of government policies specifically designed to protect human subjects in experimentation. On several occasions branches and agencies of the state and federal government have taken interest in research with human subjects. The Massachusetts Department of Public Health was drawn into the Leary-Alpert Drug Controversy mentioned above.[104] Congress held hearings on the invasion of privacy in 1965 at which government control of psychological research was discussed.[105] In May 1974, federal regulations for the protection of human subjects in medical and behavioral sciences were published in the Federal Register.[106]

The most recent version of these regulations require that before any research funding by the Department of Health Education and Welfare is approved, assurances must be provided that an "Institutional Review Board" has determined that the rights of human subjects will not be violated. The policy states that the institutional review shall determine if the subjects will be placed at risk, that the risk is so outweighed by the sum of the benefits of the research that subjects should be exposed to these risks, that subjects' rights will be protected, that legally effective informed consent will be obtained, that the conduct of the research will be reviewed, and that no grants be made unless the primary investigator is affiliated with an institution which can and does assume the responsibility for the subjects involved.[107]

These requirements (which are spelled out in great detail in Federal legislation) have resulted in the development of university policies on research involving human subjects and the formation of institutional committees which review all research projects involving human subjects.[108] These regulations (both Federal and university regulations) may have the same effect on limiting psychological research as those predicted by Gergen[109] for the American Psychological Association "Ethical Principles."[110] Cross-cultural Psychologists, Sociologists and Anthropologists may not be able to comply because informed consent is not obtainable when the subjects have not been selected and access to them is not possible without funds to travel abroad to do so.[111]

G. Responsibilities to Host Governments

The A.A.A. statement regards the obligations of researchers to host governments to be the same as their responsibilities to their own government. Researchers are obliged to be honest and candid. The researcher also should "demand assurance that he will not be required to compromise his professional responsibilities and ethics as a condition of permission to pursue the research."

Tapp et al. make the obligation to the host country government less explicit, but note that researchers should be honest in their dealings with "authorities" in the host community. They also note that the obligation (to participants) of confidentiality should not be violated and that researchers should refrain from involving members of the host community in research if participation is likely to jeopardize them (e.g., in relation to authorities...).

The relationship between U.S. researchers and foreign (host country) governments has been discussed in the ethics literature in terms of access

and limitations on what can be studied.[112]

An assumption among American academics noted by Hymes and Galtung is that scholars should have the rights of unlimited access to research subjects abroad.[113] This right has been questioned by academics[114] and challenged by the governments of several countries.[115] Some "third world" countries are requiring that research done by foreigners be of demonstrable benefit to the research subjects or the nation in which the research is conducted.[116] Some social scientists see the results of a demand for relevancy as potentially less beneficial in the long run than more "pure research".[117] Nevertheless, the number of host-country governments placing restrictions on research is probably growing.[118]

ETHICS AND EXPECTATIONS OF THOSE INVOLVED IN THE RESEARCH PROCESS: PROSPECTS

Social scientists have attempted to define their rights and obligations in their relationships with research subjects, collaborators in the host community, members of their disciplines, the public, the sponsors of their research, their own governments and the governments of countries in which they work. There has not been agreement among social scientists on what is ethical and what is not, and there is no reason to believe this situation will change. The relationships between social scientists and those with whom they interact are complex and obligations often conflict.

The complexity of the relationships between social scientists and those with whom they interact is in part attributable to conflicting obligations. An obligation to the discipline and the public to report honestly and completely, the results of research, such that it could be replicated, may conflict with an obligation to subjects to protect their anonymity. An obligation to the discipline and the community studied to do only significant research may conflict

with an obligation to be completely honest with one's subjects if significant research in an area requires the use of deception.

Some have suggested that simple statements (by professional organizations or other groups) about ethics are not the way to approach the problems.[119] For those social scientists concerned with ethics, a more productive approach may be an examination of case studies, open discussion of the issues or research on ethics and research. Books of case studies have been done and they do provide more of an indication of conflicts in obligations and interests than do simple statements about what is and what is not ethical.[120] Single works have been devoted to critical issues such as Camelot and these show the complexities of single situations and the differences in opinion on the ethical issues involved.[121] Research has also been done on the effects of ethical codes on research.[122] It seems likely that social scientists will continue to deal with ethics through the professional organizations, case studies, single works on major issues and further research. The question they are likely to give the most attention is "what should the limitations on science be?" The overwhelming conclusion of what has been done so far is that there are no simple answers.

Many social scientists have come to recognize that their set of values, ethics and goals is only one set among many.[123] They have also come to realize that as they pursue their interests, the individuals with whom they interact are pursuing their interests and there is often conflict.[124] The distinction between ethics and politics is therefore very often not clear.[125]

The resolution of ethical and political conflicts in social science research are generally considered by scholars to be the obligations and perogative of the individual researcher.[126] No matter what the individuals who write about ethics might think, those who do research realize that they

make the ethical decisions.[127] They latter also realize that rights and obligations of the researcher and the people with whom he or she deals are ambiguous and the roles are negotiated, not predetermined.[128]

Some social science professional organizations have codified ethical statements for their members but the organizations have tended to "...recoil from the enforcement of the codes".[129] As already noted, the ethics statements discussed in this paper clearly state that the responsibility for ethical conduct lies with the researcher and not with the organizations.

In recent years, those who interact with social scientists have begun to insist on certain rights and obligations of social scientists in their roles as researchers. Research subjects in the U.S. and abroad have started to resist being studied.[130] For the most part, social scientists have studied those who have not had the power (or the perception of that power) to resist being studied.[131] The growing resistence to being researched has come with the end of colonial rule abroad[132] and the politicization of minority groups in the U.S.[133]

Governments in the "Third World" are restricting access to their countries by foreign social scientists. Some are insisting that research be of benefit to their countries and/or indigenous social science communities (e.g. Papua New Guinea). There are indications that the restrictions placed on the entry of foreign researchers to some countries are the result of pressure from indigenous scholars who resent the greater resources of foreign scholars.[134] In other cases, the identification of social science research as another form of colonialism or exploitation has probably stimulated governments to insist on something in return for the priviledge of doing research.[135] Social scientists' involvement in "spying" has not helped their image either.[136] Whatever the cause, it appears that the governments of the subjects of cross-

national research are defining the rights and obligations of social scientists differently than most scholars have.

The U.S. government is also asserting itself on the behalf of those studied. The requirements for research involving human subjects discussed above are the most extensive. The requirements are for projects funded by a government department (Department of H.E.W.), and the government, like other sponsors, has always exercised some control over research for which it provides money.[137] However, in many universities, the "protection of human subjects laws" have resulted in research project reviews for the protection of human subjects for most social science research.[138]

U.S. Government control over other aspects of research may have lessened some with the furor raised over Camelot and the Thailand Affair and with the increase in money for social science research being given through the National Science Foundation.[139] However, the demand for more policy oriented research by government agencies continues to grow.[140] As the number of social scientists increases, the percentage employed by government agencies and research institutions supported by federal money is likely to grow.[141] Whether the tension observed by Horowitz between university based social scientists and those who work directly for the government will grow is as yet unclear.[142] The effects this tension will have on the development of ethics and applied research is also unclear.

Strains in the relationship between social scientists in the U.S. and those from other countries have already been mentioned. Many social scientists are advocating cross-national collaboration among social scientists.[143] Those who have written on the subject and those who have advocated it recognize the problems involved. There are, however, fewer case study books on the

subject than other forms of social science research.

The ethics and politics of research are obviously complex. They are likely to become more complex as people and institutions with whom social scientists interact make greater demands.[144] The definition of the rights and obligations of social scientists are being defined more and more by institutions which can exert control of social scientists (e.g. governments and large research organizations).

As already noted, the study of the conduct of research itself has been advocated by a number of social scientists.[145] The studies of research that have been conducted thus far are: (a) concerned with problems encountered by researchers within one country;[146] (b) self-reported case studies of solitary cross-national researchers;[147] or (c) reports on a single type of cross-national collaborative research project.[148] Although these studies add much to an understanding of the problems researchers encounter and they provide examples of solutions, they fail to consider the expectations of all the individuals involved in the research process (subjects, host-government officials, members of sponsoring agencies, etc.). Horowitz provides a more comprehensive view of the interests and expectations of the parties concerned in a single research project, Camelot, but it was aborted.[149] It was also a "crisis" and was probably in no way representative of cross-national research projects. Further research on a range of cross-national research projects focusing on the nature of the interaction among researchers, and between researchers and those with whom they interact, would probably yield useful insights into the research process and the nature of constraints on researchers and their alters. It may also tell us more about what the future holds for social scientists and what solutions to the problems encountered in research might be.

Notes

A number of individuals provided assistance in writing this paper. Dr. William McCormack, Professor of Psychology at Berkeley and Senior Fellow at the Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, Dr. Richard Brislin, Research Associate at the Culture Learning Institute and Dr. Eric Casino, Visiting Researcher at the Institute generously provided advice on the social science literature and on the focus of the paper and read earlier drafts. John Charles and Judith Hamnett assisted in the preparation of the manuscript.

1. American Anthropological Association 1971.
2. Tapp, Kelman, Wrightsman, Triandis and Coelho 1974 (Tapp et al.).
3. Rykiewich and Spradley 1976:vi.
4. American Psychological Association 1973: 3.
5. See Horowitz 1967.
6. Horowitz 1967: 4-5.
7. eg. Becker 1964; Friedson 1964; see also Boguslaw 1967: 119-127 for a description of the reaction to Camelot.
8. Rynkiewich and Spradley 1976: vi.
9. See Benson and Smith 1967 on the Harvard drug controversy; see Milgram 1963, 1964, 1965 for a description of the compliance studies and Baumrind 1964 as an example of the reaction and Milgram 1968 for a rejoinder.
10. Smith 1962; Alpert and Leary 1962 and Benson and Smith 1967.
11. American Psychologist 18(1): 56-60.
12. Current Anthropology 9(5).
13. eg. Keesing and Keesing 1971: 14-18.
14. eg. Carlsmith, Ellsworth and Aronson 1976: 94-117; Hilgard, Atkinson and Atkinson 1975: 553-554; Zimbargo and Ruch 1975: 670-681.
15. eg. Eckhardt and Erman 1977: 343-355.

16. e.g. Roszak 1969: 205-238.

17. see Frank 1969, Smith 1972, Gouldner 1970.

18. see Galtung 1967: 295-302; Hymes 1974: 48-54.

19. Myrdal 1968: 5-7; Fredrichs 1970.

20. Schroyer 1973; Birnbaum, N. 1971.

21. See Deutsch 1971.

22. Wolf 1974.

23. Scholte 1974.

24. Rynkiewich and Spradley 1976: vi; Wolf and Jorgensen 1970; Hymes 1974: 69.

25. American Anthropological Association 1969.

26. Horowitz 1977: 268.

27. See Jensen 1969 and Shockley 1973.

28. See Hirsch 1972 and McClellend 1972.

29. reported in Zimbardo, Haney and Jaffe 1973: 558-561.

30. Sjoberg 1967: xi.

31. Sjoberg 1967: xi, see also Cassels 1967: 44.

32. Becker 1964: 409.

33. published in the A.P.A. Monitor 2(7): 9-28, 1971.

34. See the A.P.A. Monitor 3(5): I-XIX, 1972.

35. American Psychological Association 1973: 5-6.

36. Gergen 1973.

37. There was also disagreement among anthropologists over the adoption of the A.A.A. "Principles of Professional Responsibility." See Colfer (1976: 45) in Rynkiewich and Spradley (1976: 32-46).

38. e.g. Horowitz 1967, Sjoberg 1967, Kelman 1968, Beals 1969, Hymes 1969, and Katz 1969.

39. There also appears to be a growing realism among those concerned with ethics which is paralleled in the research methods literature (see Platt 1976). A number of my colleagues have noted that social scientists have come to realize that "moralizing" serves no useful purpose.

40. American Psychological Association 1973.

41. The American Psychological Association's 1963 statement on ethics dealt with ethical standards for psychologists in the roles as researchers, teachers, and clinicians. The later received the greatest attention, but confidentiality and the protection of test subjects from psychological and physical harm were mentioned.

    The American Psychological Association.(1973) booklet, Ethical Principles in the Conduct of Research with Human Participants, addresses "Ethical Issues in the Sponsorship of Research, in the "Misuse of Research, in Restricting Access to Research Findings and in the Utilization of Research Results (pp. 98-104)." The document deals with many of the issues discussed in this paper, but is considered "exploratory" because of the divergence of opinion within the discipline (1973: 98). The majority of attention is given to the protection of human subjects in experimental situations as indicated in the text.

42. Tapp et al. 1974.

43. Tapp et al. 1974: 231; Goldberg 1977: 589; Himmelstrand 1977.

44. Rynkewiech and Spradley 1976: v; see also Stocking 1968: 273 and The Nation 1919, volume 10.

45. 1967: xii.

46. e.g. Moore 1967: 225; Hymes 1974: 48; Tapp et al. 1974: 231; Kelman 1967; Silvert 1967: 80; Horowitz 1967: 35-41; American Anthropological Association 1971: preamble; Bernard 1967: 133.

47. Tapp et al. 1974.

48. Tapp et al. 1974.

49. Sjoberg 1967: xii. I have found role relationships to be a useful way to systematize ethics statements. The A.A.A. and the Tapp et al. statements are arranged in terms of responsibilities or obligations to specific actors. Because the statements are for social scientists, the relationships can be viewed as the researcher and various alters as presented in Table I.

50. Tapp et al. 1974: 244.

51. Blumer 1967: 165. The arrangement of sets of obligations throughout the paper is my own. It is derived from the A.A.A. and Tapp et al. statements.

52. See also American Psychological Association 1973: section 1-2. Throughout most of the paper, obligations for cross-cultural and cross-national researchers are not distinguished from obligations incurred while working within one's own society. In cases where cross-cultural or cross-national research obligations differ from obligations of researchers working within their own culture, they are noted in the text.

The readers should be aware that not all the sources from the ethics literature cited in this paper deal with cross-cultural/cross-national research.

53. See below and also Sjoberg 1967: xiii

54. e.g., Galtung 1967: 300; American Anthropological Association, Council of Fellows 1948; Pierce-Colfer 1976: 36; Record 1967; Vaughn 1967; Sjoberg 1967b; Madan 1967; Goldner 1967; Blumer 1967.

55. Tapp et al. 1974: 224.

56. e.g. Horowitz 1967: vii; Nader 1967: 289; Moore 1967: 231.

57. See American Psychological Association 1973: 1, 27-39; Eckhardt and Ermann 1977: 353-354.

58. American Psychological Association 1973: 27-28; Kelman 1970; Zimbardo and Ruch 1975: 673.

59. See Resnick and Schwartz 1973.

60. See Wax 1977 and below pp. 23, 24, and 30.

61. Horowitz 1967, 1977: 225-274; Rynkiewich and Spradley 1976: introduction.

62. Eckhardt and Ermann 1977: 347-348; Orlan 1967: 18; Mann 1976.

63. American Psychological Association 1973: 98-99; Horowitz 1976, 1977: 225-274; Sahlins 1967; Berreman 1974: 90-94.

64. e.g., Benson and Smith 1967; Kelman 1968; Carlsmith, Ellsworth and Aronson 1976: 94-117.

65. e.g., Cohen 1976; Mann 1976; Harrell-Bond 1976; Carlsmith, Ellsworth and Aronson 1976: 112.

66. See Tapp et al. 1974: 244; American Psychological Association 1973: 58-75; Aronson 1972: 294-295; Carlsmith, Ellsworth and Aronson 1976: 98-102; Eckhardt and Ermann 1977: 350-355.

67. e.g., Rynkiewich and Spradley 1976: 2; Cohen 1976; Moore 1967: 231; Berreman 1974: 91; Galtung 1967: 297-304; Lonner 1978: 24.

68. See Horowitz 1967c, 1977; Scholte 1969: 434; Denzin 1970: 1-21; Easton 1969: 1055-1059; Rosenau 1973: 80-90; American Psychological Association 1973: 104.

69. See Himmelstrand 1977: 484; Zimbardo and Ruch 1975: 674-675.

70. See Easton 1969; American Psychological Association 1973: 104; Rosenau 1973: 21; Lonner 1978: 27.

71. See Nowak 1977: 8; Jay 1974: 377; Moore 1967: 242.

72. American Anthropological Association 1971.

73. See Keesing and Keesing 1971: 14-15.

74. See Brislin, Lonner and Thorndike 1973: 6-31.

75. e.g., The Behavioral and Social Science Survey Committee 1969: 250-260; National Science Foundation 1977; Social Science Research Council 1977: xvi; Nowak 1977; Glaser 1977; Brislin, Lonner and Thorndike 1973: 206-208; Bochner, Brislin and Lonner 1975: 10-12; Moore 1967: 234.

76. Tapp et al. 1974: 232-239.

77. Silvert 1976: 94.

78. Tapp et al. 1974.

79. e.g., American Psychological Association 1971: 103-104.

80. e.g., Pierce-Colfer 1976; Orlans 1967: 20; Horowitz 1967: 9; Goldner 1967: 263.

81. Record 1967; Horowitz 1967c: 351.

82. See Sjoberg 1967b; Madan 1967; Vaughan 1967; Sahlins 1967: 72; see below p. 28.

83. van den Berghe 1967: 183; The Behavioral and Social Science Survey Committee 1969: 266-267.

84. See Frank 1969; Smith 1972; Gouldner 1970; Roszak 1969; Scholte 1969; Record 1967.

85. See also American Psychological Association 1971: 103.

86. See Brymer and Farris 1967: 315; Colvard 1967: 339-355; Harrell-Bond 1976; Mann 1976.

87. See Sahlins 1967.

88. See Adams 1971; and Hymes 1974: 52-54.

89. Hymes 1974: 5; Keesing and Keesing 1971: 405; Sahlins 1967: 72-73.

90. American Anthropological Association 1971.

91. e.g., Record 1967; Horowitz 1967c: 361-376; see also Cain 1967; Moore 1967; Brymer and Farris 1967.

92. See Horowitz 1977: 399-418.

93. e.g., Horowitz 1967c, 1977: 398-418; Nisbet 1967: 319-338; Sjoberg 1967b: 152-161.

94. See Orlans 1967.

95. See Harris 1970.

96. See Record 1967.

97. See Horowitz 1967: 14 15, 42; and Nisbet 1967: 323-328; see Denny 1967 for an outline of State Department procedures for reviewing government sponsored research projects.

98. See Madan 1967.

99. See McCormack 1976: 1073.

100. See McCormack 1976: 1073 and Rudolph and Rudolph 1973: 30.

101. Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility (CSFR) 1977: 2-4.

102. CSFR 1977: 8.

103. CSFR 1977: 13.

104. Benson and Smith 1967: 14.

105. Wrightsman 1972: 63-64; see a reprint of the hearings in a special issue of the American Psychologist 1965.

106. Federal Register 39: 18914.

107. Federal Register 1975: 11854.

108. See Eckhardt and Ermann 1977: Appendix to chapter 24, pp. 350-355, which outlines the Human Subject Guidelines for the University of Delaware.

109. See Gergen 1973.

110. American Psychological Association 1973.

111. See Angrosino 1977.

112. e.g., Bernard 1967: 132-135; Galtung 1967: 300-301.

113. Hymes 1974: 49; Galtung 1967: 296.

114. e.g., Hymes 1974 and Galtung 1974.

115. Sahlins 1967: 72-73; Glaser 1977: 407-408.

116. See Himmelstrand 1977: 438.

117. See Rosenau 1973: 80-85.

118. Keesing and Keesing 1971: 405.

119. e.g., Sjoberg 1967: xii; Becker 1964; Gergen 1973; Goldner 1967: 265.

120. e.g., Sjoberg 1967 and Rynkiewich and Spradley 1976.

121. See Horowitz 1967.

122. e.g., Berscheid, Baron, Dermer and Libman 1973; Resnick and Schwartz 1973.

123. Brymer and Farris 1967; 316-317; Moore 1967; Vaughan 1967: 75; Record 1967: 43-47; Rynkiewich and Spradley 1967: 3; Cohen 1976: Hymes 1974: 52-53; Bogusław 1977: 107; and Gergen 1973.

124. Sjoberg 1967: introduction; Vaughan 1967: 50; Bernard 1967.

125. Sjoberg 1967: xii; Record 1967: 46-48; Vaughan 1967: 50; Benson and Smith 1967: 133; Madan 1967; Moore 1967: 225; Goldner 1967: 245; Brymer and Farris 1967; Bernard 1967; and Beals 1969.

126. American Psychological Association 1973: 1, 7-16; American Anthropological Association 1971: preamble; Tapp et al. 1974: 242; Vaughan 1976: 74; Colvard 1967: 345.

127. Rynkiewich and Spradley 1976: v; Colfer 1976: 44-45; Mann 1976: 107-108; Harrell-Bond 1976: 116-120; Hansen 1976: 132-134; Chrisman 1976; Orlans 1967: 17-21; Vaughan 1967: 71; Madan 1967: 173; Goldner 1967: 264-265; Aronson 1972: 294.

128. Vaughan 1967: 264-265. The notion of role negotiation is a useful conception of what Vaughan and others have referred to as "emergent" roles.

129. Record 1967: 46.

130. Moore 1967: 231; Sahlins 1967: 72; Hymes 1974: 5; Nader 1974: 289; Keesing and Keesing 1971: 405; Sue 1972; Harrington 1973.

131. Horowitz 1967: v; Nader 1974: 302; Hymes 1974: 58-59; Willis 1974: 123; Bochner, Brislin and Lonner 1975: 9.

132. Willis 1974: 146.

133. Moore 1967: 231; Willis 1974: 146; Clemmer 1974: 244-245.

134. See McCormack 1976: 1074; Tagumpay-Castillo 1968.

135. Galtung 1967: 295-302; Gough 1967.

136. See McCormack 1976: 1070-1071; Sahlins 1967: 72-73; Jorgensen 1971.

137. Orlans 1967: 4-6.

138. Eckhardt and Ermann 1977: 350-355.

139. National Science Foundation 1976: 12; National Research Council 1968: 97; see also Harris 1970.

140. Horowitz 1977: 417; Rosenau 1973: 80; National Research Council 1968: 17-21; The Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee 1969: 212-221.

141. The Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee 1969: 211-224.

142. Horowitz 1977: 403-404.

143. Tapp et al. 1974; National Research Council 1968: 7-9, 72-77; The Behavioral and Social Science Survey Committee 1969: 251-260; Galtung 1967: 305-312; Nowak 1977: 4; Glaser 1977: 405-408; Moore 1967: 234; Bochner, Brislin, and Lonner 1975: 10-11; Jacob and Jacob 1977.

144. Benzin 1970: 12.

145. e.g., Blazer 1977: 430; Rosenau 1973: 24; Platt 1976: introduction.

146. e.g., Platt 1976; The Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee 1969.

147. Cohen, Langness, Middleton, Uchendu and Vanstone 1973; Rynkiewich and Spradley 1976; and Sjoberg 1976.

148. e.g. Glaser 1977.

149. Horowitz 1967.

REFERENCES

Alpert, R. and T. Leary
1962
"Letter to the Editor." The Harvard Crimson, December 13, 1962.

American Anthropological Association
1971
"Statements on Ethics: Principles of Professional Responsibility." Adopted by the Council of the American Anthropological Association May 1971. (reprinted in M. Rynkiewich and Spradley (eds.) Ethics and Anthropology, New York: John Wiley and Son, 1976, pp. 183-186).

American Anthropological Association
1969
"Statement of the Executive Board of the A.A.A." Bulletin of the American Anthropological Association, Annual Report.

American Anthropological Association, Council of Fellows
1948
"Resolution on Freedom of Publication." Washington, D.C. American Anthropological Association.

American Psychological Association
1973
Ethical Principles in the Conduct of Research with Human Participants. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

American Psychological Association
1973
"Method Followed in Development of the Ethical Principles." In Ethical Principles in the Conduct of Research with Human Participants. Pub. by the American Psychological Association.

Angell, R.C.
1964
"Report of the Committee on Professional Ethics." American Sociological Review 29(6): 904.

Aronson, E.
1972
The Social Animal. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Baumgardner, S.R.
1977
"Critical Studies in the History of Social Psychology." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 3: 681-687.

Baumrind, D.
1964
"Some thoughts on the ethics of research: after reading Milgram's 'Behavioral Study of Obedience'." American Psychologist 19: 4211-4223.

Beals, R.L.
1969
Politics of Social Research: An Inquiry into the Ethics and Responsibilities of Social Scientists. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Becker, H.S.
1964
"Against the Code of Ethics." Letter to the Editor of the American Sociological Review 29: 409-410.

Benson, J.K. and J.O. Smith
1967
"The Harvard Drug Controversy: A Case Study of Subject Manipulation and Social Structure." In Sjoberg (ed.), Ethics, Politics and Social Research. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Company. pp. 115-140.

Bernard, J.
1967
"Conflict as Research and Research as Conflict." In Horowitz (ed.), The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot. Revised edition 1974. Cambridge Mass: MIT Press pp. 128-152.

Berreman, G.D.
1974
"Bringing It All Back Home." In D. Hymes (ed.) Reinventing Anthropology. New York: Vintage Books, pp. 83-118.

Berscheid, E., R.S. Baron, M. Dermer, and M. Libman
1973
"Anticipating Informed Consent: An Empirical Approach." American Psychologist 28(10), pp. 913-925.

Birnbaum, N.
1971
Towards a Critical Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bochner, S., R. Brislin and W. Lonner
1975
Introduction. In R. Brislin, S. Bochner and W.J. Lonner (eds.) Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Learning. New York: Halsted Press Division of John Wiley and Son, pp. 3-36.

Boguslaw, R.
1967

"Ethics and Social Scientists." In Horowitz (ed.) The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot, 1974 edition. Cambridge, Mass. M.I.T. Press, pp. 107-127.

Brislin, R., Lonner, W. and Thorndike, R.
1973

Cross-Cultural Research Methods. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Brymer, Richard A. and Farris, Buford
1967

"Ethical and Political Dilemmas in the Investigation of Deviance: A Study of Juvenile Delinquency." In Sjoberg, G. (ed.), Ethics, Politics and Social Research. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., pp. 297-318.

Buss, A.R.
1975

"The emerging field of the sociology of psychology." American Psychologist 30(10): 988-1002.

Cain, L.D.
1967

"The AMA and the Gerontologists: Uses and Abuses of 'A Profile of the Aging: U.S.A.'." In Sjoberg (ed.), Ethics, Politics and Social Research. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc. pp. 78-114.

Carlsmith, J.M., Ellsworth, P.C. and Aronson, E.
1976

Methods of Research in Social Psychology. Reading Mass.: Addison Wesley Pub. Co.

Chrisman, N.J.
1976

"Secret Societies and the Ethics of Urban Field Work." In Rynkiewich and Spradley (eds.), Ethics and Anthropology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 135-147.

Clemmer, R.O.
1974

"Truth, Duty and the Revitalization of Anthropologists: A New Perspective on Culture Change and Resistance." In Hymes (ed.), Reinventing Anthropology. New York: Vantage Books, pp. 213-250.

Cohen, F.G.
1976

"The American Indian Movement and the Anthropologist: Issues and Implications of Consent." In Rynkiewich and Spradley (eds.), Ethics and Anthropology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 81-94.

Cohen, R., Lang ess, Middleton, J. Uchendu, V. and Vanstone, J.
1973
"Entre into the Field." In Naroll, R. and Cohen, R. (eds.) A Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology. New York Columbai University Press, pp. 220-245.

Colvard, R.
1967
"Interaction and Identification in Reporting Field Research: A Critical Reconsideration of Protective Procedures." In Sjoberg, G. (ed.), Ethics, Politics and Social Research. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., pp. 319-358.

Committee on Professional Ethics,
American Sociological Association
1964
Code of Ethics (First Draft). Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.

Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility,
American Association for the Advancement of Science
1977
Annual Report 1977. Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Committee on the Social Sciences
in the National Science Foundation
1976
Social and Behavioral Science Programs in the National Science Foundation: Final Report. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.

Crawford, E. and Biderman, A.
1969
Social Scientists and International Affairs. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Cvetkovich, G.
1977
"Dialectical Perspectives on Empirical Research." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 3: 688-696.

Daniels, Arlene Kaplan
1967
"The Low-Caste Stranger in Social Research." In Sjoberg, G. (ed.), Ethics, Politics, and Social Research. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., pp. 267-296.

Denny, G.C.
1967
"State Department Procedures for Reviewing Government Sponsored Foreign Area Research." In Horowitz (ed.), The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot, 1974 edition. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, pp. 211-228.

Denzin, N.K. (ed.)
1970
The Values of Social Science. Chicago: Aldine.

Easton, D.
1969
"The New Revolution in Political Science." The American Political Science Review 63(4): 1051-1061.

Eckhardt, K.W. and Erman, M.D.
1977
Social Research Methods: Perspective, Theory, Analysis. New York: Random House.

Elms, A.
1975
"The Crisis of Confidence in Social Psychology." American Psychologist 30(10): 967-976.

Frank, A.G.
1969
Latin American Underdevelopment or Revolution. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Fredricks, R.W.
1970
Sociology of Sociology. Toronto: Collier-Macmillan.

Friedson, E.
1964
"Against the Code of Ethics." Letter to the Editor of the American Sociological Review. 29: 410.

Galtung, J.
1967
"After Camelot." In Horowitz (ed.), The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot, revised edition, 1974. Cambridge Mass.: M.I.T. Press, pp. 281-312.

Gergen, K.J.
1973
"The Codification of Research Ethics: views of a doubting Thomas." American Psychologist. 28(10): 907-912.

Gergen, K.J., Morse, S.J. and Gergen, M.M.
1979 (in press)
"Behavior Exchange in Cross-Cultural Perspective." In H. Triandis and R. Brislin, (eds.), Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Vol. 5 Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1979, in press.

Glaser, W.A.
1977

"The Process of Cross-National Survey Research." In A. Szalai and R. Petrella with S. Rokkan and E.K. Scheuch (ed.), Cross-National Comparative Survey Research. New York: The European Co-ordination Centre for Research and Documentation in Social Services, pp. 403-435.

Goldner, Fred H.
1967

"Role Emergence and the Ethics of Ambiguity." In Sjoberg, G. (ed.), Ethics, Politics, and Social Research. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., pp. 245-266.

Gough, K.
1967

"Anthropology: Child of Imperialism." Monthly Review 19 (11): 12-27.

Gouldner, A.
1970

The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology. New York: Avon Books.

Hansen, J.F.
1976

"The Anthropologist in the Field: Scientist, Friend, Voyeuz." In Rynkiewich and Spradley (eds.), Ethics in Anthropology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 123-134.

Harrell-Bond, B.
1976

"Studying Elites: Some Special Problems." In Rynkiewich and Spradley (eds.), Ethics and Anthropology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 111-120.

Harrington, R.
1973

One man's special island. Parade, January 7, 1973, pp. 315-323.

Harris, F.R.
1970

"The Need for a National Social Science Foundation." In Denzin (ed.), The Values of Social Science. Chicago: Transaction Books, pp. 185-194. (This is an edited version of remarks made in the U.S. Senate by Senator Harris on January 22, 1969).

Himmelstrand, Ulf
1977

"Internationalization and Application: Extending the Reach of Survey Research." In A. Szalai and Petrella, R. with Rokkan, S. and Scheuch E.K. (eds.), Cross-National Comparative Survey Research. New York: The European Co-ordination Centre for Research and Documentation in Social Services, pp. 437-488.

Hilgard, E.R., Atkinson, R.C. and Atkinson, R.C.
1975

Introduction to Psychology, sixth edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc.

Hirsch, J.
1970

Behavior-genetic analysis and its biosocial consequences." Seminars in Psychiatry 2(1): 89-105.

Horowitz, Irving
1967a

The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot, Horowitz, Irving (ed.), The M.I.T. Press, pp. 3-44, 1967.

Horowitz, Irving Louis (ed.)
1967b

"Preface." In Horowitz (ed.), The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot, 1974 edition. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, pp. vi-vii.

Horowitz, Irving
1967c

"Social Science and Public Policy: Implications of Modern Research." In Horowitz (ed.), The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot, 1974 edition. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, pp. 339-376.

Horowitz, Irving
1977

Ideology and Utopia in the United States. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hymes, D.
1974

"The Use of Anthropology." In D. Hymes (ed.), Reinventing Anthropology. New York: Vintage Books, pp. 3-79.

Jacob, B. and Jacob, P.
1977

"Leaders' Values and Community Activeness: The International Studies of Values in Politics." In Szalai, A. and Petzella, R. with Rokkan, S. and Scheuch, E.K. (eds.), Cross-National Comparative Survey Research. New York: Pergamon Press, pp. pp. 231-278.

Jay, R.
1974

"Personal and Extrapersonal Vision in Anthropology." In D. Hymes (ed.), Reinventing Anthropology. New York: Vintage Books, pp. 367-381.

Jorgensen, J.
1971

"On Ethics and Anthropology." Current Anthropology 12(3): 347-350.

Katz, M.C. (ed.)
1969

Sciences of Man and Social Ethics. Boston: Branden Press.

Keesing, R. M. and Keesing, F.M.
1971

New Perspectives in Cultural Anthropology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Kelman, H.C.
1968

A Time to Speak: On Human Values and Social Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kelman, H.C.
1970

"Deception in Social Research." In Denzin (ed.), The Values of Social Science. Chicago: Trans-action Books, pp. 65-75.

Kumar, K.
1976

Indigenization and Transnational Cooperation in the Social Sciences. Honolulu: The Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii. December 1976.

Lonner, W.J.
1978

"Issues in Cross-Cultural Psychology." Paper presented at the Current Perspectives on Cross-Cultural Psychology Conference, Honolulu, Hawaii, May 2-4, 1978.

Madan, T.N.
1967

"Political Pressures and Ethical Constraints Upon Indian Sociologists. In Sjoberg, G. (ed.), Ethics, Politics, and Social Research. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., pp. 162-179.

Mann, B.J.
1976

"The Ethics of Fieldwork in an Urban Bar." In Rynkiewich and Spradley, Ethics and Anthropology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 95-108.

Margolin, J.B.
1963

"Ethical Standards of Psychologists." American Psychologist 18: 56-60.

McClelland, D.C.
1972

"Do I.Q. tests measure intelligence?" Saturday Evening Post, Summer 1972.

McCormack, William
1976

"Problems of American Scholars in India." In Asian Survey, 16(11): 1064-1080.

Milgram, S.
1963

"Behavioral study of obedience." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 67: 371-378.

Milgram, S.
1964

"Group pressure and action against a person." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 69: 137-143.

Milgram, S.
1965

"Some conditions of obedience and disobedience to authority." Human Relations 18: 57-76.

Milgram, S.
1968

"Reply to the critics." International Journal of Psychiatry 6: 294-295.

Miller, A.G.
1972

The Social Psychology of Psychological Research. New York: Free Press.

Moore, Joan W.
1967

"Political and Ethical Problems in a Large-Scale Study of a Minority Population." In Sjoberg, G. (ed.), Ethics, Politics, and Social Research. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., pp. 225-244.

Myrdal, G.
1968

Asian Drama, Vol. I, New York: Pantheon.

Nader, L.
1974

"Up the Anthropologist -- Perspectives from Studying Up." In Hymes, D. (ed.), Reinventing Anthropology, 1974 edition, New York: Vintage Books, pp. 284-311.

National Research Council
1968
The Behavioral Sciences and the Federal Government. Washington: National Academy of Science.

National Science Foundation
1977
Division of International Programs, National Science Foundation. Washington, D.C.: N.S.F.

Nowak, S.
1977
"The Strategy of Cross-National Survey Research for the Development of Social Theory." In Szalai, A., Petrella, R. in collaboration with Rokkan, S. and Scheuch, E.K. (eds.), Cross-National Comparative Survey Research. New York: Pergamon Press, pp. 3-48.

Orlans, Harold
1967
"Ethical Problems in the Relations of Research Sponsors and Investigators." In Sjoberg, G. (ed.), Ethics, Politics, and Social Research. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., pp. 3-24.

Pierce-Colfer, Carol, J.
1976
"Rights, Responsibilities and Reports: An Ethical Dilemma in Contract Research." In Rynkiewich, M. and Spradley, J., Ethics in Anthropology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 32-46.

Platt, J.
1976
Realities of Social Research. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Rappoport, L.
1977
"Towards a dialectical social psychology." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 3: 678-680.

Record, Jane Cassels
1967
"The Research Institute and the Pressure Group." In Sjoberg, G. (ed.), Ethics, Politics, and Social Research, Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., pp. 25-49.

Resnick, J.H. and Schwartz, T.
1973
"Ethical Standards as an Independent Variable in Psychological Research." American Psychologist 28(2): 134-139.

Rosenau, J.N.
1973

International Studies and the Social Science Problems, Priorities and Prospects in the U.S. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

T. Roszak
1969

The Making of a Counter Culture. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

Rudolf, S. H. and Rudolf, L.I.
1973

"Politics of American Scholars." Illustrated Weekly of India, November 23, 1973.

Rynkiewich, M. and Spradley, J.P.
1976

Ethics and Anthropology. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Sahlins, Marshall
1967

"The Established Order: Do Not Fold, Spindle, or Mutilate." In Horowitz, Irving (ed.), The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot. Cambridge, Mass. M.I.T. Press, pp. 71-79.

Samelson, F.
1975

"On the science and politics of the I.Q." Social Research 42: 467-488.

Schroyer, T.A.
1973

A Critique of Domination: The Origins and Development of Critical Theory. New York: G. Braziller.

Sears, R.R.
1967

"Privacy and behavioral research." Washington, D.C.: Office of the President.

Silvert, K.H.
1967

"American Academic Ethics and Social Research Abroad: The Lesson of Project Camelot." In Horowitz (ed.), The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot, revised edition 1974. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, pp. 80-106.

Singh, A.
1977

"The New World Order and the Globalization of Social Science: Some implications for teaching cross-culturally." In Brislin, R. and Hamnett, M (eds.), Topics in Culture Learning, Vol. V. Honolulu: Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center.

Sjoberg, G.
1967a

"Introduction." In Sjoberg, G. (ed.), Ethics, Politics, and Social Research. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., pp. xi-xvii.

Sjoberg, G.
1967b

"Project Camelot: Selected Reactions and Personal Reflections." In Sjoberg, G. (ed.), Ethics, Politics, and Social Research. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., pp. 141-161.

Smith, R.E.
1962

"Psychologists Disagree on Psilocybin Research." The Harvard Crimson, December 17, 1962: 1.

Smith, Jr., W.C.
1972

"A Dependency Bibliography." In Bonilla, F. and Girling, R. Structures of Dependency. Stanford 1972.

Scholte, B.
1974

"Toward a Reflexive and Critical Anthropology." In D. Hymes (ed.), Reinventing Anthropology. New York: Vantage Books, pp. 430-457.

Social Science Research Council
1977

Annual Report 1976-1977. New York: S.S.R.C.

Stocking, G.N.
1968

Race, Culture and Evolution. New York: The Free Press.

Szalai, A. and Petrella, R. (eds.)
1977

(Round Table Conference on) Cross-National Comparative Survey Research, Budapest, 1972. -- (papers and proceedings). Oxford & Elmsford, N.Y.: Peragamon Press.

Sue, D.W.
1972

"Ethnic Minorities: Resistance to Being Researched." Professional Psychology ?: 11-17.

Tagumpay-Castillo, G.
1968

"A View from Southeast Asia." In S.E.A.D.A.G., American Research on Southeast Asian Development: Asian and American View. New York: The Asia Society, pp. 20-49.

Tapp, J.L., Kelman, H.C., Wrightsman, L.S., Triandis, H.C. and Coelho, G.V.
1974
"Continuing Concerns in Cross-Cultural Ethics: A Report." International Journal of Psychology 9(3): 231-249.

The Behavioral and Social Science Survey Committee,
National Academy of Sciences and the Social Science Research Council
1969
The Social and Behavioral Sciences: Outlook and Needs. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Tiryakian, E.A.
1971
The Phenomenon of Sociology: A Reader in Sociology of Sociology. New York: Appleton-Century Croft.

van den Berghe, P.L.
1967
"Research in South Africa: The Story of My Experience with Tyranny." In Sjoberg (ed.), Ethics, Politics, and Social Research. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., Inc., pp. 183-197.

Vaughan, Ted. R.
1967
"Governmental Intervention in Social Research: Political and Ethical Dimensions in the Wichita Jury Recordings." In Sjoberg, G. (ed.), Ethics, Politics, and Social Research. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., pp. 50-77.

Wax, M.L.
1977
"On Fieldwork and Those Exposed to Fieldwork: Federal Regulations and Moral Issues." Human Organization 36(3) 321-328.

Wolf, E.R. and Jorgensen, J.
1970
"The Thailand Issue and the Ethics Committee: A Reply to the A.A.A. Executive Board." Newsletter of the American Anthropological Association. 11(9).

Wrightsman, L.S.
1972
Social Psychology in the Seventies. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company

Zimbargo, P.G. and Ruch, F. L.
1975
Psychology and Life. Glenview, Illnois: Scott, Foresman and Co.